

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/701,710	SHARMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	George R. Evanisko	3762	

All Participants:

(1) George R. Evanisko.

(2) Carol Barry.

Status of Application: ____

(3) ____.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 25 October 2006
Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: to include "an optical" before the "transmission member" since the transmission member could, in its broadest reasonable interpretation, be an electrical conductor. The voltage sensitive dye was put in functional terms (adapted to deliver...dye) in the amendment, so a simple pacemaker lead that delivers a fluid/medication would meet the limitations of claim 1, and therefore "an optical" was included in the claim to overcome a possible art rejection.